

APPLICATION NO.

10/030,033

666 FIFTH AVE

24972

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

FILING DATE

03/28/2002

03/22/2004

7590

NEW YORK, NY 10103-3198

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI, LLP

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspio.gov

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
HUBR-1202	8924

ART UNIT

1714

YOON, TAE H

PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 03/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR

Markus Antonietti

		-	me
r	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Astion Comments	10/030,033	ANTONIETTI ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	,
	Tae H Yoon	1714	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communion. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mai earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti eply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da id will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fror ute, cause the application to become ABANDON	mely filed ys will be considered timely. n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03</u>	January 2002.		
2a)☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)☑ Th	nis action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under			
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) <u>22-42</u> is/are pending in the applicate 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrest 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) <u>22-42</u> is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examination The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct that any objected to by the state of the sheet of	ccepted or b) objected to by the ne drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is old	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). pjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d)	ı.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicationity documents have been receiveau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No red in this National Stage	
Attach mout(a)			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summar	v (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail D	oate	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	8) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal 6) ☐ Other:	Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 1714

The specification is objected since a subsection title, Brief Descriptions of Drawings, is missing on page 10.

The recited "especially water or salts" in claim 29 is objected and a separate claim reciting such narrow limitation is suggested.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 22-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The recited "<u>nonaqueous</u> miniemulsion" in claim 22 is confusing since said claim also recites employing an osmotically stabilizing component (such as water as seen in claim 29 and claim 32 wherein 0.1 to 40% by weight is taught) and since the water forms an <u>aqueous</u> composition. Also, the recited "inorganic polymerization" in claims 37 and 38 is confusing and indefinite since a formation of metal oxides from a metal precursor is not a polymerization, for example.

The examiner interprets that the instant <u>nonaqueous</u> miniemulsion encompasses an <u>aqueous</u> miniemulsion as long as said <u>aqueous</u> miniemulsion contains a nonaqueous fluid dispersing medium and since the use of water is claimed.

Art Unit: 1714

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 22, 23, 28, 29, 37, 38 and 40-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Linehan et al (US 5,770,172).

Linehan et al teach a process for producing a nanometer-sized metal compound by a reverse micelle or reverse microemulsion system in the abstract and examples and col. 3, lines 1-26. Said microemulsion yielding a particle size of about 20 nm (col. 3, lines 55-60) meets the instant miniemulsion. The amount of surfactant and water and the use of non-polar solvents and additional reactants is taught at col. 4, line 33 to col. 5, line 32. Thus, the instant invention lacks novelty.

Claims 22-24 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Candau et al (US 4,521,317).

Art Unit: 1714

Candau et al teach a microemulsion process at col. 3, lines 16-47 and in example 1 wherein a particle size of 3.8 nm I s seen. Thus, the instant invention lacks novelty.

Claims 22-24, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kozakiewicz et al (US 5,037,881).

Kozakiewicz et al teach a microemulsion process at col. 5, lines 45-65 and in example 1. Thus, the instant invention lacks novelty.

Claims 22-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Jenkins et al (US 5,739,378) in view of Kozakiewicz et al (US 5,037,881) or Linehan et al (US 5,770,172).

Jenkins et al teach a process of making emulsion polymers in abstract and at col. 4, line 23 to col. 8, line 55 wherein various reactants and polymerization techniques are seen. Isocyanato and epoxy functional groups (col. 6, lines 1-3) and various reactions thereof (col. 8, lines 1-20) and inverse emulsion polymerization or non-aqueous dispersion polymerization (col. 8, lines 29-31) are taught.

The instant invention further recites a nonaqueous miniemulsion polymerization over Jenkins et al. However, said nonaqueous miniemulsion polymerization is well known as taught by Kozakiewicz et al and Linehan et al.

Art Unit: 1714

It would have been obvious to one skilled I the art at the time of invention to utilize the art well known polymerization method of Kozakiewicz et al or Linehan et al in Jenkins et al since Jenkins et al teach the utilization of any art known polymerization technique and the use of various organic solvents is an obvious choice depending on the reactants used absent showing otherwise.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US Pat. 5,686,518 to Fontenot et al teach a miniemulsion in an aqueous continuous medium.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tae H Yoon whose telephone number is (571) 272-1128. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (571) 272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1714

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Twell Cyron Tae H Yoon Primary Examiner Art Unit 1714

THY/March 15, 2004